

BEFORE THE  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH Case No. 2015010324

ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO  
REOPEN CASE

On March 5, 2015, Student filed a request that the Office of Administrative Hearings reopen the above-titled case on the grounds that Parent was rescinding her consent to the March 3, 2015 Settlement Agreement entered between Parent and Hemet Unified School District, which resulted in the dismissal of Student's case.

On March 5, 2015, District filed an opposition to Student's request to reopen this matter and to set aside the Settlement Agreement.

Settlement agreements are interpreted using the same rules that apply to interpretation of contracts. (*Vaillette v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co.* (1993) 18 Cal.App.4th 680, 686, citing *Adams v. Johns-Manville Corp.* (9th Cir. 1989) 876 F.2d 702, 704.) "Ordinarily, the words of the document are to be given their plain meaning and understood in their common sense; the parties' expressed objective intent, not their unexpressed subjective intent, governs." (*Id.* at p. 686.) If a contract is ambiguous, i.e., susceptible to more than one interpretation, then extrinsic evidence may be used to interpret it. (*Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. G. W. Thomas Drayage & Rigging Co.* (1968) 69 Cal.2d 33, 37-40.) Even if a contract appears to be unambiguous on its face, a party may offer relevant extrinsic evidence to demonstrate that the contract contains a latent ambiguity; however, to demonstrate an ambiguity, the contract must be "reasonably susceptible" to the interpretation offered by the party introducing extrinsic evidence. (*Dore v. Arnold Worldwide, Inc.* (2006) 39 Cal.4th 384, 391, 393.)

The parties signed the Settlement Agreement on March 3, 2015, that resolved all claims in this matter. Student did not establish that anything in the agreement gave Parent the right to rescind to the agreement. Further, OAH lacks the legal authority to set aside a settlement agreement. Pursuant to *Y.G. v. Riverside Unified School Dist.* (C.D.Cal. 2011) 774 F.Supp.2d 1055, 1061-1062, OAH does not have the authority to modify a settlement agreement or determine whether it was a contract of adhesion. (See, Ed. Code, § 56501, subd. (a).) A party's remedy to enforce the terms of a settlement agreement is either to file a compliance complaint with the Superintendent of Public Instruction or institute a court

action. (See, *Porter v. Manhattan Beach Unified School District* (9th Cir. 2000) 307 F.3d 1064, 1074.) Accordingly, Student's request to reopen this case is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: March 6, 2015

/s/

---

PETER PAUL CASTILLO  
Presiding Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Administrative Hearings